

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.
JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

Volume XXXVII.....No. 38

AMUSEMENTS THIS AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-fourth street.—
THE NEW OPERA OF DIORCE.

GRAND OPERA HOUSE, corner of 3d av. and 3d st.—
EUROPEAN THEATRICAL COMPANY. Matinee at 2.

WOOD'S MUSEUM, Broadway, corner 3d st.—
Performances afternoon and evening.—On Hand.

WALLACK'S THEATRE, Broadway and 11th street.—
JOHN GALT.

ACADEMY OF MUSIC, Fourteenth street.—
English Opera.—The Marriage of Figaro.

MINOR'S GARDEN, Broadway, between Prince and
Houston streets.—Bliss Crook.

BOVARY THEATRE, Bowery—WILL HATLEY—AN-
TIOPE AND ORPHEUS.

ST. JAMES' THEATRE, Twenty-eighth street and Broad-
way.—DONALD.

STADT THEATRE, Nos. 46 and 47 Bowery.—THE MERRY
WIVES OF WINCHESTER.

OLYMPIC THEATRE, Broadway.—THE BALLET PAN-
TOMIME OF HUMPHY DUMPTY. Matinee at 2.

BOOTH'S THEATRE, Twenty-third st., corner Sixth av.—
JULIUS C. MAR.

OLIVE THEATRE, 7th and 7th Broadway.—PETERSEN;
OR, OVER THE RELIABLE.

MRS. F. B. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.—
MAN AND WIFE.

PAR' THEATRE, opposite City Hall, Brooklyn.—
DARING DICK, THE BROOKLYN DETECTIVE.

BROOKLYN ACADEMY OF MUSIC, Montague street.—
UOLIN TOM'S GAIN.

THEATRE COMIQUE, 114 Broadway.—COMIC VOCAL-
ISTS, NEGRO ACTS.—DEVOUCED. Matinee at 2.

UNION SQUARE THEATRE, Fourteenth st. and Broad-
way.—NEGRO ACTS.—BELLINGER, BELLINGER, & Co. Matinee at 2.

THIRTY-FOURTH STREET THEATRE, near Third av.—
VALIETY ENTERTAINMENT.

FRY'S PASTORS' OPERA HOUSE, No. 301 Bowery.—
NEGRO COMEDY.—BELLINGER, BELLINGER, & Co.

FRY'S NEW OPERA HOUSE, 234 st., between 6th
and 7th av.—FRY'S MINSTRELS.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTREL HALL, 536 Broadway.—
THE SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.

STEINWAY HALL, Fourteenth street.—LECTURE ON
JAMES PINK, J.

PATILION, No. 638 Broadway.—THE VIENNA LADY OR-
CHESTRA.

ASSOCIATION HALL, 5th street and Third av.—
Matinee at 2.—GRAND GALEA CONCERT.

NEW YORK CIRCUS, Fourteenth street.—SCENES
IN THE RING. ACROBATS, &c. Matinee at 2.

DR. KAHN'S ANATOMICAL MUSEUM, 74 Broadway.—
SCIENCE AND ART.

TRIPLE SHEET.

New York, Wednesday, February 7, 1872.

CONTENTS OF TO-DAY'S HERALD.

- Page.
- 1.—Advertisements.
 - 2.—Advertisements.
 - 3.—The War in Mexico: The Government Forces Completely Routed and Deserting to the Revolutionaries; Matamoros Preparing for Resistance—France: President Thiers Shot at by an Assassin, but Unhurt—Telegrams from England, Ireland, Scotland, Spain and Italy—Sumner's Hero: Auditing the Remains of General Robert Anderson; Ousebaux at Fort Monroe—Connecticut Democratic State Convention—Admiral's Visit to Capital—City's Explosions—Movements of the Grand Duke.
 - 4.—The Eagle and the Bear: Another of Our Diplomatic Rump; Catanzar's Case in Still Another Form; Mr. Cramer, our Representative at Copenhagen, Makes a Big Sensation; He Attempts to Lead Mr. Frick's Son at a Dinner, but is Prevented; Old Gortchakoff in a Rage; He Calls Cramer "this Animal" and "Brother-in-law of President Grant"—Around the City Hall—Naval Intelligence—Disasters at Sea: Harrowing Details of the Burning of the Steamer American; Approves Loss of Life; The Ship's Crew Fighting with Revolvers for the Means of Safety; Total Loss of the American-Built Ship White Rose; The National Rifle Association—"Green Shooting Home News"—The Stuyvesant Bank Troubles—Newburg Savings Bank Troubles—Royal Irish Masons: Session of the Grand Lodge of England—St. Mary's House for Invalids—Assault on a Third Avenue Conductor.
 - 5.—The President's Secretary: A Very Mixed Medley: Proceedings of the Brooklyn Presbytery Yesterday—The Custom House Committee: Additional Testimony in Relation to the Alleged Fraud—The Progress of the Fire in Newark—Correction—Sale of the Wellington Collection—Nova Scotia—The Kilian-Fear Election—Contest—Another Municipal Medley: Alleged Fraud in Westchester County—A New Charter for Brooklyn—Reception of the New England Society—A Big Building Building—Heavy Rain in Newark—New York State Medical Society.
 - 6.—Editorials: Leading Article, "Shall We Be Peace or War? The Ultimate of the Question—The Administration Must Stand or Fall Upon This Issue"—Amusement Announcements.
 - 7.—Editorials: (Continued from Sixth Page)—The Washington Treaty: Progress of the British National Agitation Against the American Claims; The Queen's Declaration to Parliament; Disraeli and Gladstone Pronounce the American Claims "Preposterous and Absurd"; The Question in Congress: "If England Wishes to Break the Treaty Let Her Say Amen"; What the Grand Jury of the Nations of Europe Says: North German, Austrian and Franco-Belgian Opinion—Business Notices.
 - 8.—Warmoth and Carter: Report of the Congressional Committee Concerning the Inquiry: The History of the Quarrel: Treks and Intrigues, Trade and Plots for the Possession of the Western Hemisphere—The Historical Society—The Weed Will Case—The Will of the Late William Kelly—Heavy Rain in Newark—New Jersey Executive Appointments.
 - 9.—Insurance Investigation: The Committee from the Assembly at the Chamber of Commerce Hearing Witnesses—The Trenton Bank Robbery—Give Us Cuba for Gibraltar—Scandal at the Hoffman House—Desperate Conflict With a Supposed Burglar—Pioneer Death in Saratoga, N. Y.—Financial and Commercial Reports—Domestic Markets—Marriages and Deaths.
 - 10.—The Washington Treaty (Continued from Seventh Page)—News from Washington—Louisiana: Examination for the Possession of the Territory—The Japanese and the Mormons—Shipping Intelligence—Advertisements.
 - 11.—Public Executions: A Brutal Regime Rung in Tennessee; His Son of a Rebel Parent: A Negro Rung in Charleston, S. C.; Details of the Terrible Scenes—The Tichborne Trial—Sentences of the Chicago Aldermen—Advertisements.
 - 12.—Advertisements.

THE FIRE OF THE OLD FLINT OF '76 comes from the Green Mountains through the voice of Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, on the Washington Treaty.

UTAH—JUDGE MCKEAN, THE GENTILES AND THE MORMONS.—The Mormons having made a dead set upon Judge McKean, the Gentiles of Utah, it will be perceived, are rallying to his support, and the chances are as ten to one that they will carry the day, at the White House and in Congress.

PRESIDENT THIER'S life was attempted by an assassin on Monday night. A shot was fired at him, but he escaped unhurt. So says a London journal on the authority of "special" information from Paris. We hope sincerely, for the sake of humanity and the cause of morality in Europe, that the statement has been made under mistake, and that the political distractions of France have not induced any of her sons to so outrage the feelings of the venerable patriot.

MR. HUSTED, of Westchester, wants his gravel contract business investigated by his brother Assemblymen at Albany. Husted is sharp and sagacious. He knows what a harmless tribunal an Albany legislative committee is.

IS THE REFORM LEGISLATURE going to do anything to break up the Erie "Ring"? Or has it resolved to sell itself to the men who purchased its predecessors?

Shall We Be Peace or War?—The Ultimatum of England—The Administration Must Stand or Fall Upon This Issue.

The country has learned with satisfaction and pride of the position assumed by the President upon the Alabama question. His declarations to the correspondent of the HERALD that the case as submitted to the Geneva tribunal must stand the judgment of the tribunal, precisely as the presentation of the Confederate cotton debt by England, and that we cannot be instructed or admonished by the British Ministry as to what we say or do not say before a tribunal where both parties have an equal standing, have been received by the country with unqualified expressions of approval. The United States would have been willing to have had the whole Alabama question discussed and settled upon a final and peaceful basis. If this discussion is interrupted, and the settlement postponed by the abrupt and extraordinary action of England, we are not to blame for the consequences. We have gone as far as we could with honor. We cannot in honor recede.

In this discussion we are met by the traditions of British diplomacy. The British Foreign Office is largely governed by the remembrances and teachings of Palmerston. That famous Minister, "the lusty Englishman," as his admirers were wont to call him, was fond of menace as a sure weapon of diplomacy. When some trembling, anxious nation, like Turkey, or China, or Denmark, declined to accept his decrees as laws, he moved a fleet to their ports and threatened to burn a town or two, and generally had his way. We have read how the Danish fleet was burned merely because the King of Denmark was supposed to be under the control of Napoleon; how the Turkish fleet was destroyed when its Grecian policy displeased London; how the summer palace of the Chinese Emperor was pillaged because the Emperor had his own notions about trading with the foreigner. All that England has in her fleet, which moves around the world like the village bully, governing by threats. In dealing with greater powers there has been a reserve and decorum complimentary to British prudence, and that fine sense of the necessity of money as the chief end of nations, which controls the average British mind. When Russia invaded the Principalities of the Danube England waited until France made common cause before she assailed the great empire of the North. When Denmark asked her to observe her treaty obligations and prevent the spoliation of her little kingdom, England looked at the stupendous Power of Prussia and ignored the treaty. When Russia called upon her to withdraw from her Black Sea pretensions she was glad to comply, the traditions of Palmerston were disregarded, and peace was gained by national surrender and humiliation.

The United States have, time and again, been regarded by England as proper subjects for the diplomacy of menace. When we objected to British cruisers searching our merchantmen she sent a squadron here and burned our Capitol, and would have continued her depredations but for the victory at New Orleans. When we claimed our natural boundary in Oregon we were compelled to abandon our rights, under the threat of a fleet, which overcame the nerves of the timid Polk and the trembling Buchanan. When we seized the persons of notorious rebels on the high seas—in the case of Mason and Slidell—we were commanded to surrender them in the most offensive manner. We were then in a death struggle with the South, and Palmerston's menaces were well timed and successful. During the rebellion England paid as little attention to our rights, to the sacred duties of neutrality, to our professions of friendship and our ties of blood as she did to the protests of China on the opium question. When the South broke into rebellion she made haste to treat them as belligerents, as a people entitled to a nation's rights, even before a battle was fought. During our war English money sustained the confederacy, English ships, manned by English seamen, destroyed our commerce, and even the right of privateering, which had been solemnly denounced as piracy by England, was accepted and protected so far as the South was concerned, even after we had expressed a desire to unite in her declaration. The promptness with which we yielded to the Palmerston policy of pressure, especially in the Trent affair, is so freshly remembered in England that she naturally reverts to it now in the Alabama question.

What is the exact situation? We have met the English in a solemn conference. That conference calmly and patiently agreed to certain rules of procedure and principles of international law. A tribunal was appointed satisfactory to England and ourselves. We presented our case and named eminent and learned men to go before the tribunal and plead that case. England did the same thing. The nature of her case is unknown to us. We do not know what claims she will plead in offset. We know that the Confederate debt was submitted and we regard it as not unlikely that the sinking of the Florida and the Alabama as the property of British subjects, as British ships manned by British seamen, may be among the damages recited in her bill. It would be as proper to advance these claims as those arising out of the Confederate debt. We should not formally complain if they did, for we made no complaint at the presentation of the Confederate debt, although we might have resented it as an indignity had we been disposed to menace. We mean to go before the tribunal in good faith and say to the distinguished men who are to pass judgment just what we did and did not suffer. That is our right. It is a matter with which England has nothing to do. If we are wrong; if our demands are exorbitant; if we cannot sustain them by evidence; if it can be shown that England did her duty by us as a neutral and not a friendly Power; if it is seen that all this time our grievances have been dreams, and cannot stand before the cold, calm, pitiless logic of the disinterested and keen men who are to hear and determine, then we shall be defeated without murmur. But England says to us that we must tell our story and plead our cause in our way, but in her way; in other words, she will present her case and ours at the same time. And so the Queen has made what she calls a friendly communication to us asserting this determination, and we are

called upon to take back our declarations, to admit our treachery and insincerity of character, by saying that we were dishonest in our pleadings, to go to Geneva with a case amended to suit England, which will practically be a confession of judgment against ourselves.

We feel that we have been eminently fair in this whole business. We have expressed no anxieties as to the decision of the tribunal. If it does not award a dollar to us we shall not complain. We entered into this negotiation not in a mercenary spirit, nor to humiliate England, nor with any purpose of obtaining an unfair advantage over her. Having done this, we mean to stand by our case and accept the decision of the tribunal. England must either take this treaty and observe it or accept the consequences of receding. She must learn that the Palmerston traditions are as little heeded in Washington as in St. Petersburg and Berlin. She may add menace to menace, and send her navies to our coasts and threaten us with the extremity of wrath. We mean to obey a solemnly accepted law, which is the law to us all. The American people are united in this resolution as they have rarely been united before. If President Grant gives way a single point his administration will be wrecked. He could not go before the country and get an electoral vote with a record of surrender and humiliation. This will be his record if, under the pressure of English public opinion, a public opinion inspired by ignorance and arrogance, he consents to withdraw his case and virtually admits that he was capable of dishonesty and bravado.

And as to war, we do not fear it, nor have we any apprehensions that there will be war. The results of a contest would be to cripple the English commerce as severely as our own was crippled during the rebellion, to occupy Canada and Mexico and drive the British flag from the Continent. A town or two might be burned, even as Sebastopol was burned; our coasts might be blockaded, and we should have no more wines and brandies, no silks or spices—perhaps a small supply of coffee and tea—but we should learn the precious lesson of our own resources, our capacities for self-subsistence, our power to stand alone and defy the world with shut gates—the lessons of prudence, thrift and self-reliance. We should add to our wealth by this compelled development of our resources more than we should lose by any possible expense of war, and President Grant would emerge from the strife with the glory of having planted the flag over the whole Continent, of having driven the foreigner from America. If the President were moved by vulgar ambition, if he saw war as a passion or the means of power and glory, if he were controlled by the ignoble purposes which were underlying the characters of Napoleon and Frederick, he would welcome a conflict with England upon the very issue which she now so unwisely thrusts upon us. But the President, as we have said, is a man of peace. He has shown a moderation, a prudence and a love for peace which give us the highest guarantee that he will not wantonly cause a single gun to be fired in anger. For this reason, more, perhaps, than any other, his resolution to accept no indignity from England, and to be moved by no menace—to stand by the "American case" as presented by his Cabinet—is joyfully accepted by the country. He will find the country behind him. He will see that whatever divisions there may be on domestic questions as against England upon an issue like this the country is a unit, and will support him to any extent and in every emergency. The cause is not of a party, but of the republic, and every patriot so regards it. We are not democrats or republicans now, but Americans, resolved to have our rights against the strongest and proudest nations in the world.

Mexico No Better—Thunder All Round the Sky.

The budget of Mexican despatches which we publish this morning exhibits our sister republic in all the glory of fighting factions, small gangs of revolutionary filibusters, here, there and everywhere, and formidable bands of highway robbers operating on the principal roads, including the railway between Puebla and the capital. And yet, with all these troubles upon them, and with seven hundred deaths from smallpox in the city of Mexico during the last month, and with the whole country impoverished and in chaos, our Mexican friends are pushing ahead a new railroad from Vera Cruz as fast as the periodical drafts of Juarez upon the workmen for soldiers will permit, and they are talking, too, of getting up a world's fair in the "Hall of the Montezumas." Verily, this is *opera bouffe* on a grand scale, or, rather, it is a mingling of all the elements of farce and tragedy, blood and buffoonery, only to be found in Mexico. And still our government looks on with perfect indifference, although we stand responsible before the world for this scandalous state of things, and morally bound to put an end to it in interdicting everything in any shape of European intervention.

A SLIGHT MISTAKE.—The Queen of England says that in the American case "large claims were included which were understood on my part not to be within the province of the arbitrators." Let Her Majesty read the treaty carefully over again, and perhaps she may change her mind. Indeed, we are almost sure she will, with the aid of her Joint High Commissioners and General Schenck, who was one of ours. He alone, no doubt, can make it all right, chapter and verse. Let Her Majesty, then, send for Schenck to read to her the treaty.

ANOTHER FATAL COLLIERIES EXPLOSION occurred yesterday in the black country of Pennsylvania. An inspector, accompanied by four miners, entered the Mitchell Colliery for the purpose of relaying a track on one of the runs, and they had been at work but a few minutes when a fire-damp explosion took place and three out of the four men were instantly killed; the fourth was badly injured. The theory of the inspector is that the leader of the men carelessly omitted to ascertain the state of the atmosphere within the mine, and exposing an unprotected light the explosion and loss of life followed.

The Queen's Speech on the Alabama Claims—She Denies the "American Case"—A Firm Front the Only Alternative Left to General Grant.

The Queen's speech, delivered yesterday to the two houses of the British Parliament, on the "American case" on the Alabama claims, is very brief, but very much to the purpose. Her Majesty says:—"The arbitrators appointed pursuant to the Treaty of Washington for the purpose of amicably settling the Alabama claims have held their first meeting at Geneva. Cases were laid before the arbitrators on behalf of each party. In the case so submitted by America (meaning the United States of America) large claims were included which are understood on my part not to be within the province of the arbitrators. On this subject I have caused a friendly communication to be made to the government of the United States." This communication is no doubt a remonstrance against these "large claims," which Her Majesty holds to be "not within the province of the arbitrators," and an appeal to our government to modify its case by striking out these "large claims," held by Her Majesty to be inadmissible.

Here, then, we stand. Queen Victoria, from the "American case," as presented to the arbitrators at Geneva by Messrs. Caleb Cushing, William M. Evarts and their colleagues, as counsel for the United States, appeals to President Grant against the bill and for its withdrawal and modification, so as to exclude those disputed claims, and, meantime, the sittings of the arbitrators at Geneva are suspended. A special HERALD despatch, which we give this morning on the subject, informs us that in London the Alabama madness continues to rage, but that some journals, which were outright in their position, are suddenly silent; that the excitement has certainly been fostered by the government (Mr. Gladstone) as a convenient diversion against awkward home questions; that any embarrassment which this Alabama furor may cause can readily be escaped by appeals to popular prejudices against American extravagance. Our correspondent further informs us that the *Daily Telegraph* complains of the timidity and hesitating course of the English press on this question, and denounces our demands for indemnity for the British prolongation of the war of our late rebellion as so monstrous that the only way against them is to shut the door in the face of all indirect demands from our side under the head of these Alabama claims; that the *London Times* and *Nova* hold substantially the same ground, while leading journals of Germany and Austria contrast the silence and moderation of the American press with the clamor of the English, while the *Memorial Diplomatique*, of Brussels, stoutly argues the admissibility of the "American case."

Several points in this new controversy are thus brought out into bold relief. First, we see that this scandalous hue and cry of the British press was instigated and is fostered by the Gladstone government as a "convenient diversion against awkward home questions;" secondly, that through the Queen's speech on the "American case," Mr. Gladstone puts himself upon his defence in the House of Commons; and thirdly, that from the general tone, so far, of the leading political journals of the European Continent, England will stand alone in this new and extraordinary attitude before the Board of Arbitration, which she jointly assisted in arranging and appointing, and which she has accepted on these Alabama claims. The essential fact, however, with which we have to deal is this:—Mr. Gladstone has deliberately staked his fortunes, as the head of the British government, and the fortunes of his party upon the ultimatum that the "large claims" included in the "American case," as submitted to the Geneva Board of Arbitrators, being held by him as "not within the province" of said Board, must be withdrawn, or England withdraws from the arbitration and the Washington Treaty falls to the ground. The Queen's speech is the speech of her Prime Minister.

In the House of Commons the paragraph relating to the Alabama claims was immediately seized upon as a salient point for debate, even before the address in reply to the speech from the throne had been voted. Disraeli displayed his inclination to use the subject of the proceedings which were had before the Geneva Court of Arbitration, and of the Gladstone diplomacy generally thereto, as a powerful Parliamentary leverage against the Cabinet. Disraeli was British, and persistent, however, in his assertion against payment of the American claims, and seemed inclined to outbid the Premier in an appeal to John Bull's stubborn prejudices in the matter. He did not succeed in this, however. Mr. Gladstone responded in the same tone and vein, his words having the additional force which always follows from the vehemence of the Treasury benches. He classed the American demand, for indirect damages particularly, as "preposterous and absurd," and declared that no people, but particularly a nation moved by the feeling which animates the British people, would ever submit to them. This declaration of the Minister was cheered to the echo, while the ex-Premier and ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, Disraeli, appears to have lost the party chance which the occasion afforded him for a moment, or "missed his tip," as a celebrated English novelist has described the failure of an almost superannuated acrobat in the circus arena.

We do not care here to argue the untenable character of this false position of Mr. Gladstone. We cannot entertain for a moment the idea that Mr. Secretary Fish, Mr. Cushing, Mr. Evarts and their colleagues concerned, learned in the law, in making up the "American case" for Geneva have overstepped the provisions of the Washington Treaty or the precedents or the generally accepted law of nations in such cases. We accept the "American case" as the case provided for in the treaty, whether covering twenty, fifty or a thousand millions of indemnity; but the government and the people of the United States, while satisfied of the justice of their demands for direct and consequential losses for which England is responsible, having submitted their case to these arbitrators at Geneva, are willing to abide by their judgment as to the indemnity to be paid. In the hands of these five arbitrators—one from the United States, one from England, one from Italy, one from Switzerland and one from Brazil—we have

placed our case, satisfied with the justice of our claims and that justice will be done by the Board, but ready to accept their awards as a settlement, whatever they may be. England's protest against our bill and the hue and cry of the British press against its submission to the Court of Arbitration is an insult to the court, as well as an offense to the United States, entitled to no respect whatever. It is a base attempt to bully, not only our government, but the Geneva arbitrators, for which the only appropriate reparation is an honest apology to the United States and to the eminent and honorable men of the arbitration.

Mr. Senator Edmunds hits the nail upon the head in submitting that the protest of England against the "American case" betrays an intention "to revoke the Treaty of Washington unless the claims of the United States shall be presented upon a principle and in a manner agreeable to the other party." But these remarks and the accompanying resolution of Mr. Edmunds mean something more than a mere expression of opinion. They mean that General Grant will stand by the "American case" as the case authorized by the treaty, and he cannot do otherwise. If Mr. Gladstone, in order to save himself from a vote of condemnation by the Commons on home affairs, finds it necessary to appeal to the patriotism of John Bull against "the insolent pretensions of the Yankees," General Grant upon this issue has no alternative but to meet him face to face—peace or war. The general voice of this country will now soon be heard upon this subject, and it will be, as it is coming in, a general voice for the "American case," and no abatement to the extent of a penny under English bullying and impertinence.

Indeed, from the pressure of public indignation, and from the danger of a ruinous popular reaction upon this question in the event of any concessions to British bravado, we think it not impossible, from what has already been done by England and the English press, despite the sudden silence of some of the journals and the modified language of others, to prejudice our claims before the Geneva Conference, that General Grant may be compelled to withdraw from the arbitration and proclaim the absolute revocation and abandonment of the Washington Treaty before the return of the day of its ratification by the Senate. There will be no safety to the administration in temporizing with England upon this business. The opposition elements of the country were never so earnest, so industrious or so desperate in their efforts to compass the defeat of General Grant for the Presidential succession as they are to-day. They are moving heaven and earth upon civil service reform, revenue reform, Custom House frauds, and all sorts of charges of maladministration to defeat him; but with the odds still overwhelmingly in his favor. But let him back down from this "American case," at Geneva and he will be overwhelmingly defeated. Against this disgraceful and ignominious retreat from the true American position on these Alabama claims, with all the concessions they have agreed to, the glorious services of General Grant in the field of war and in the field of diplomacy, in the work of reconstruction at home and in the cause of peace at home and abroad, will not avail to save him from the wrath of an offended people.

And upon this issue what would be the consequences following General Grant's defeat? Conspicuous among them would be a war with England; for what to the ruling elements of the opposition, if successful, the Copperheads and Southern confederates, would be the depreciation of our national securities or the final redemption of the national debt, outstanding or prospective? Who can answer? While these great issues of our civil war—the national debt and the financial necessities resulting from it—are in danger from a sudden political revolution, the re-election of General Grant becomes a most important matter. Not till within the last three days did there appear to be any possible combination of hostile forces, or any probable contingency in our domestic or foreign affairs within range of the chapter of accidents that would be sufficient to prevent his re-election. But now the contingency has come which may make or break him, which may exalt him above all the glories he has achieved, or bring him, with all the laurels he has gained, down in the dust. To advance higher in the affections, the confidence and gratitude of the American people he has only to stand by their claims as submitted by his agents to the arbitrators at Geneva; to lose the support of the people he has only to abandon their cause in this case in submission to the astounding insolence and presumption of John Bull.

We have, however, not the slightest misgivings as to the policy of General Grant on this difficulty. He is not the man to be bullied. He is remarkable for his amiable, generous and conciliatory disposition; but he is quite as remarkable for his firmness against anything like foul play, double dealing, dictation or bravado. And so, if the "friendly communication" of England's amiable Queen embraces a request for the abatement of the "American case," we are confident that a friendly reply will be given to Her Majesty, but embracing the information that our case as submitted is our ultimatum. Then, no doubt, we shall see that Senator Cameron is right in his opinion that "England does not intend to disgrace herself by repudiating the treaty or any part of it." In any event a firm front on the "American case" is the only alternative left to General Grant.

THE SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS AND THE MISSOURI POSSUM POLICY.—The *Mobile Register* says it does not know what the magical effects of the Missouri possum policy may be "on the spot," but it is satisfied that elsewhere and beyond those charmed bounds democrats do not mean to become such idiots as to ruin themselves in "trying to make an alliance with the liberal republicans and then to be deserted and left the bag to hold." If it should be the money bag—"spoils"—they are to hold, no doubt the proposed alliance would be more generally tolerated by the straight-out democrats.

THE LIQUOR AND LAGER BEER business is to be again placed in fetters. Senator Palmer has introduced a stringent license law in the Senate. What are the German republicans going to do about it?

Common Yesterday—The Alabama Treaty in the American Senate and in the British Parliament—Amnesty and Education.

It is a little remarkable that at the same moment, in the Senate of the United States and in the British House of Commons, the same question should have been occupying attention. That question was the misunderstanding that has arisen as to the interpretation and scope to be given to the recent treaty, by which it was expected that the difficulties arising out of the Alabama claims were finally and amicably settled and provided for. The question came up in the Senate in the form of a resolution, offered by Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, asking the President for information respecting the alleged intention of the English government to revoke the treaty unless the claims of our government were presented at Geneva on principles and in a manner agreeable to that of Great Britain. The resolution gave rise to a discussion of some length and importance, in which the mover of the resolution expressed himself in a manner that might be regarded as decidedly smacking of war. Mr. Trumbull, who is always moderate and sensible in his views, criticised the taste of indulging in war sentiments at a time when the two nations were engaged in giving effect to a treaty which was designed to remove all feelings of irritation and hostility. Mr. Cameron, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who might be supposed to speak by authority, said he was quite sure that the President was not in possession of the information asked for, and avowed his disbelief in the intention attributed to the British government. How little he knew of what he was talking about will be seen by a glance at the speech of Queen Victoria, on the opening of the British Parliament, just at the very moment that this discussion was taking place in the Senate. The position ascribed to the English government, and which Mr. Cameron did not credit, was laid down in language that could not be doubted or misconstrued. The Queen says that in the case submitted by America large claims were included which were understood, on her part, not to be within the province of the arbitrators; and she adds that she had caused a friendly communication on the subject to be made to the government of the United States.

The claims to which Her Majesty refers are, of course, for indirect or consequential damages resulting from the depredations of the privateers. It is difficult to understand how such an important point in the negotiations could have been left open or doubtful, but it appears that such must have been the case. Even so, however, we think that that point might have been fairly left to the judgment and decision of the arbitration. If they did allow consequential damages the line would be drawn, doubtless, so as not to extend the principle unduly. It might not be feared, for instance, that they would allow compensation for the decay and loss of our commerce, which is attributed by some, not to the natural effect of an oppressive tariff and illiberal navigation laws, but to the terror inspired by the British-built privateers sailing under the Confederate flag. The British government might wisely have taken that view of the case and trusted to the judgment and impartiality of the arbitrators.

The Congressional Committee which has been so long engaged in exposing the beauties of our Custom House system here has had an additional duty imposed upon it, by a resolution, adopted yesterday by the Senate, instructing it to inquire into the abuses and extortions alleged to be practised at Quarantine and into the health regulations of this port generally. If the committee obey its instructions it will have to rescind its resolution of adjournment, which was fixed for next Saturday.

A bill was reported from the Finance Committee for the redemption of the three per cent temporary loan certificates at a rate not exceeding three millions per month. The Amnesty bill was afterwards taken up and debated. The House proceedings yesterday were not marked by any interesting features. An hour and a half was spent in filibustering to defeat the desire for a new drawing of seats, and the rest of the day was consumed in a debate on the Educational bill. The dispute between Delaware and Massachusetts for moral supremacy was not resumed, and the discussion was consequently tame and spiritless. The vote on the bill is to be taken to-day, and there is every indication that it will pass as a party measure, Mr. Farnsworth being the only republican who has indicated any opposition to it.

THE SALT DUTY.—The Committee of Ways and Means have under consideration the question of abolishing or modifying the duty on salt and are hearing evidence from the "salt interest." This ought to be a very simple question to decide. Salt is an article of prime and universal necessity. Not only is it used by every man, woman and child with their food, but it is used also for improving the soil and crops and by all the stock raisers—yes, by every poor person who has a pig to be salted. It is a monstrous absurdity to impose a duty on this article to favor a few hundred people who manufacture it or even for the purpose of revenue. The Committee of Ways and Means should spend no more time on this subject, but recommend at once the abolition of the duty.

THE MEMPHIS APPEAL says the reform, possum, passive movement pervades Indiana; quotes the *Nashville Union* to show how it is spreading in Tennessee, and speaks for itself as follows:—"The South has everything to gain and nothing to lose by any political revolution, and we are therefore content to await developments and accept any suggestion or approve any fusion of parties that will surely relieve us of the autocracy of villany." The "anything-to-win" policy seems to be the prevailing sentiment of the Appeal.

THE AUDIT BOARD.—The bill supplementary to the law creating the new temporary Board of Audit and Apportionment, which is now before the Legislature, meets the approval of all the members of the Board. It is required, in the Comptroller's opinion, to facilitate the payment of claims, and to render more clear the duty of the Board in the apportionments for the several departments of the city government. It should be